157322

MENTAL

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION III
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-4431

Ms. Judi Durda
Weinberg Consulting Group, Inc.
Suite 300
1220 19th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Ms. Durda:

As a follow up to our telephone conversation yesterday, some documentation is appropriate.

As you were given the tables on Monday at the end of the meeting, it was mentioned that the values are to be used as starting point for screening level risk assessments. In many cases, site specific-data and conditions dictate adjustments in the values. But in cases where the risk assessor fails to use or acknowledge contaminants that are reported at rather high levels, we use the tables in assessing potential risk. An example in your case is the high levels of PCBs reported in the drainage ditch sediments. In this case, we would make the determination that PCBs are at levels known to cause adverse impacts to ecological receptors that are endemic to such habitats and would make the further determination that a potential for risk exists.

Attached is a cover sheet that should accompany the tables. At this point you should also know that the table does not reflect anything other than Region III BTAG thinking and is neither EPA regional or national policy. It is merely a means for us to make 'safe' determinations where insufficient quality/quantity of data are available or where textural discussions neither explain fully nor use reasonable baseline values in calculating potential risk. The tables are for your use only as a guide for our use in judging sites.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me on 215/597-3155.

Sincerely,

Rob Davis

Robert S. Davis, Biologist

cc K. Melvin
J. Dodd
P. Knight

nant of concern if it is released from soils as a result of physical disturbance or chemical contamination. For example, a spill of highly concentrated acid could conceivably cause the soil to release high quantities of aluminum. In such cases, aluminum may, in the judgement of the risk assessor, be a contaminant of concern.

In sum, site-specific information and conditions may vary, dictating adjustment of the criteria used in the risk assessment, but the values in the table can be used as a starting point for any ecological risk assessment.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION III
303 Methodist Building
11th & Chapline Streets
Wheeling, WV 26003

FEDERAL EXPRESS
OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

AUG 15 1995

Mr. Scott Slagley
RF & P Corporation
Main Street Centre, 23rd Floor
600 East Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Re: Potomac Yard Site
City of Alexandria and Arlington County, Virginia

Dear Mr. Slagley:

EPA is in receipt of RF&P's August 10, 1995 request for a six (6) business day extension to respond to EPA Region III's comments on the human health and ecological risk assessment for the above referenced Site. RF&P's request for additional time to resubmit the human health and ecological risk assessment is hereby granted. EPA understands that the risk assessment will be revised and submitted on or before August 22, 1995.

Please call me at (304) 234-0254 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey A. Dodd, OSC/EPA Project Coordinator
U.S. EPA Region III Removal Enforcement Section

cc: Karen Melvin, U.S. EPA Region III, Rem. Enf. Sect. (3HW33)
Gene Wingert, U.S. EPA, VA/WV Rem. Sect (3HW41)
Roy Smith, U.S. EPA, Tech. Sup. Sect. (3HW13)
Bob Davis, U.S. EPA, Tech. Sup. Sect. (3HW13)
William Skrabak, Alexandria Health Department
Joan Becker, Arlington County Health Department
Tom Modena, VDEQ-Richmond
Cynthia Sale, VDEQ-Woodbridge
Hiron Sikdar, TAT-Delran